

July 8, 1985

TERR F.6
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5251

of democracy, the destruction of terrorism, an international alliance against terrorism and a willingness to seriously commit ourselves to a 5-, 10-, or 15-year war if that is necessary to ensure that in the end it is the free people, the democracies who survive, and it is the terrorists who shall have perished.

I thank the Speaker.

DEMOCRATIC RADIO ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE MARY ROSE OAKAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, MARY ROSE OAKAR of Ohio, used the Democratic radio address last Saturday to present a clear and honest account of the budget issues facing Congress and raised the issue of fairness in the President's tax reform proposals.

It was an excellent statement which I introduce into the RECORD for the convenience of my colleagues:

DEMOCRATIC RADIO ADDRESS OF CONGRESSWOMAN MARY ROSE OAKAR, JULY 6, 1985

(Following is the prepared text of Congresswoman Oakar's remarks in response to President Reagan's radio address:)

Hello. This is Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar. I represent Cleveland, Ohio, and am Secretary of the Democratic Caucus of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. President, on this 4th of July weekend, all Americans join with you in being grateful for the hostages' safe return and pledge to work with you to prevent a recurrence.

We celebrate the 209th birthday of our country this holiday weekend. On July 4th, 1776, the members of the Continental Congress approved the Declaration of Independence.

An eloquent document that embodied the aspirations of our forefathers for tax justice and political freedom heralded our beginning.

What makes the 4th of July such a special holiday is that these ideals have proved so enduring. They are as relevant today as they were two centuries ago as our Nation undertakes the historic effort of framing a new federal income tax system that is fair to all.

It is only fitting that we talk this weekend about you and your taxes.

We Democrats stand ready to cooperate with the President in fashioning a tax bill that meets the true test of fairness: a tax bill that gives real relief to middle-class families who have homes and children who aspire to a higher education.

How we treat the middle-class families of the Parmas, Petersburgs, Peorias, and Portlands of America will be the real measure of our success.

The President's tax package is not fair to the middle-class. It's as simple as that. It's our job as Democrats and Americans to make it fair.

When you cut through the speeches and the hoopla, you see clearly that the President's plan shifts the tax burden once again onto the middle-class.

Middle-income families who have worked to achieve success would be stuck with an even higher tax tab.

Let me give you some examples:

Middle-class families where the husband and wife work would be hit hard by the loss of the two-earner tax deduction, commonly known as the marriage penalty. The President's bill would eliminate it.

This deduction was put in the tax law to offset the higher tax married people pay on their combined income. The two-earner deduction is a matter of fairness.

Its repeal would mean that two-income families would end up paying much more in taxes than under the current law.

Two-wage earner families would also be hurt by the loss of the credit for child-care expenses. Many families today pay a great deal each month to the babysitter or day care center so that mother and father can work. They need the extra income to save for their vacation, their children's education, or just to make ends meet.

The President's plan would convert the existing credit for child care into a tax deduction. This would reduce the taxes of affluent families—those who least need another break—much more than the taxes of low and middle-income families.

In addition, middle-class taxpayers would be hurt by the loss of the deduction for state and local taxes. This deduction, which the President would eliminate, has been part of our country's basic tax law since 1913.

It ensures that you are not taxed twice on your hard-earned income.

As President Reagan said two years ago, repeal of the state and local tax deduction would mean "you'd pay tax on a tax." He was right then. Let's hold him to his word now.

To the millions of you who are homeowners, it would mean that you would not be able to deduct your local property tax.

Those of you who want to buy your first home may find it out of reach because you had planned on taking the state and local tax deduction to make your monthly payments affordable.

These changes that the President wants would put the squeeze on the middle-class taxpayer and family. He wants to eliminate those tax provisions that lower your taxes.

Finally, the President's tax plan would add to the deficit in the future. We all know that the record deficits run up by this Administration have a devastating impact on the middle-class.

The colonists threw the tea into Boston Harbor in 1773 to make the point that taxes should be fair and just. We fought for our independence to protest taxation without representation.

Today, the message must be the same. I want you to know that the Democrats hear you.

Let us, your elected representatives, know whether you want a tax bill that is in the spirit of the American Revolution—a bill that gives real relief to the middle-class and requires all Americans to pay their fair share.

Mr. President, we Democrats stand ready to work with you on tax reform. But we want it to be fair to America's majority—the middle-class. ●

TERRORISM AND THIRD WORLD FREEDOM FIGHTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN], will be recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I took a special order for the purpose of discussing a recent article by former President Richard Nixon called "The Case for Supporting Third World Freedom Fighters."

But before I do that I would like to make some comments on the previous special order of the gentleman from Georgia dealing with terrorism.

One of the things that it seems to me is absolutely clear and one thing that he made reference to is the fact that terrorism is in fact a state of war, under different terms and under different words, and unless we recognize that it is a state of war, those who engage in terrorism will take advantage of democracies of this world and they will continue to do so, much to our disadvantage.

We who believe in a rule of law, because we do not recognize the nature of terrorism, find ourselves constrained by an international law that the terrorists do not recognize.

In most countries, all those democracies of the world who do believe in the rule of law, recognize exceptions to that law during times of warfare. There is conduct that is allowed during times of warfare, when warfare is recognized, that are not allowed in other times, no countenanced by those governments. And until we begin to recognize the essential difference of terrorism from random violence without an intention and from organized, state-conducted and state-recognized warfare, we will be at a disadvantage to the terrorists of the world.

One of the things that the gentleman from Georgia did not refer to specifically is one the restraints that has been placed on the CIA. There is a restraint that has been involved in several administration which does not allow the CIA to involve itself in something known as assassination. That grows out of the previous practice, well, the alleged rampant practice of assassination engaged in by the CIA when it was called a rogue elephant and when it was brought to heel by congressional committees.

I am not one who wants us to return to those days of alleged actions but it does seem to me to be a concern of us that terrorists use the difficulty that we in determining who is involved in a particular terrorist attack against us. In other words, the very uncertainty, the very ambiguity that terrorists have, that they involve themselves in, is a protection against the organized countries of the world retaliating against them. It just seems that perhaps some uncertainty practiced by ourselves would be to our advantage. That is, if we attempt to determine who it was who killed the American Navy man who was aboard the TWA flight and killed him only for one reason, that is he was an American serviceman, if we can determine their identity and if we can determine their location and if the governments of the

H 5252

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 8, 1985

countries in which they reside refuse to turn them over to us, ought that to be the end of it? I would suggest it should not and cannot be if we are to be effective in war against terrorism.

□ 1350

It seems to me we ought to allow, only when approved at the highest levels of our Government and with the consultation by the Congress, if that is deemed to be necessary, forces from this Government to attempt to retrieve those individuals and bring them to justice in any way that is appropriate.

I am fearful that the prohibition against assassination which still remains with respect to the CIA would not allow us to engage ourselves in that activity. Again, I am talking about specific individuals who we know were involved in the murder of American citizens overseas taking advantage of their supposed uncertainty, taking advantage of the protection that is allowed them in certain countries around the world.

We should not put ourselves in the position that the only response we must have is a military response, because then we basically take out of our hands an ability to retaliate against those we know to be responsible.

In many ways, the military response is a more broad-gauge response, and is a response that many times would involve, unfortunately, innocent civilians and a more direct attack against those specifically involved, specifically responsible for the terrorism is necessary and in order.

Those are not easy words to say; it is not easy for the Congress to contemplate giving the authority for us to go after these figures to agencies that have been denied that authority in the past, but if this is a different age, or if it is in some ways a repeat of the piracy of several hundred years ago, we must respond in ways that are different than what we did last year or last month or the last decade when terrorism was not such an active force in this world aimed against the very innards of democracy and aimed specifically against American innocent civilians.

Because I fear unless we do things such as this, every American around the world, traveling to the Holy Land, traveling to Europe, traveling to South America, traveling to Africa, with no political intent in mind, with no governmental purpose, with no ideological purpose, with nothing but to visit another part of the world, will be at risk and will continue to be at risk.

So I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia for his well-thought-out position against terrorism and I would hope that we would engage the thoughts and minds of all in the Congress and in the executive branch for a unified project against terrorism, which may require us to do some things that we ordinarily would not do in a time of peace, but which is neces-

sary when we are engaged in war by other terms, by other means, and by other words.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the major subject of my special order today, an article by former President Richard Nixon entitled, "The Case for Supporting Third World Freedom Fighters."

Mr. Nixon posits the question before us: What is the proper response of the United States at a time when there are Third World freedom fighters, at a time when there are those who are opposing totalitarianism around the world? Ought we to act, in the eloquent terms of President Kennedy's inaugural address in 1961 where he stated that the United States should support any friend and oppose any foe in the defense of freedom.

Is this good rhetoric? But is it bad policy? Mr. Nixon answers it this way, by quoting the dictum of Frederick the Great: "He who attempts to defend everywhere defends nothing."

And so, Mr. Nixon, in attempting to elicit some sort of ground rules for determining American action finds these: He says, before the United States provides support for anti-Communist freedom fighters, three conditions must be met.

First, our assistance must be in the interests of the people of the target country. Second, support for the freedom fighters must be in our own national interest; and third and probably just as importantly for action, the freedom fighters must have some chance for some success.

He goes on in his article to give us several different examples to perhaps most articulate the differences of circumstances around the world. He suggests, for instance, that the People's Republic of China, what we used to refer to as Red China, has a Communist government, that most assuredly denies the Chinese people of many of the freedoms we cherish.

He points out, therefore, that China meets the first condition, but he then questions whether it meets the second condition or the third condition. In other words, does China at present threaten America, America's friends, or America's interests?

He answers it this way: On the contrary, it provides an indispensable counterweight to the Soviet Union, which does present a threat currently to America, America's friends, and America's interests.

He suggests that it would be both a strategic and moral mistake for the United States to support a Chinese freedom fighters movement that has no chance of success, no matter how sympathetic it might be in principle to its goals.

He then asks us to look at the country of Poland, and he says that Poland meets both condition one and condition two. In other words, Poland is governed by a government which is, at this point in time, denying the rights to those people it claims to represent.

Second, supporting the freedom fighters in Poland against the Polish Government would be in our national interest, replacing the Communist regime with a democratic government would therefore be in the interests of both the brutally repressed Polish people and in our interests; that is, in establishing a beacon of democracy in the middle of Eastern Europe.

He points out that Poland fails the third condition, because any uprising against the military regime would be put down brutally by the Soviets, and he asks whether anyone can say that we assisted the people of Hungary in 1956 when we incited them to rebellion and then watched helplessly as they were crushed.

He goes on to say that a case can be made that Angola, Afghanistan, and Cambodia meet all three conditions. It is interesting that he makes this comment, because in fact there is bipartisan support in this House for assistance to the freedom fighters in Afghanistan, for freedom fighters in Cambodia, and I would suggest that there is a developing consensus for support for the freedom fighters in Angola.

He points out that the clearest case for our support of the freedom fighters actually lies much closer in geographic proximity to the United States; the clearest case is Nicaragua.

Former President Nixon points out that supporting the Contras is in the interests of the Nicaraguan people who suffer under a repressive government that denies them any chance to bring about peaceful change for the better.

He points out further that it is in the interests of the United States, since Nicaragua poses a threat to its non-Communist neighbors and also is potentially the first Soviet base on the American mainland.

Then he takes the third condition, and suggests that because of the broad support of the freedom fighters and the widespread opposition to the Communist government among the Nicaraguan people, it also meets condition three.

In other words, the anti-Communist Contras, with our help, can succeed.

The reason I bring this article to the attention of my colleagues, and it is an article that was published in its entirety in the RECORD by the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, several weeks ago, is that we find difficulty in articulating and then implementing a policy which suggests where we can act where we should not act.

That is, if we take President Kennedy's words at face value, we should support every freedom fighter in the world no matter what the consequences. We should support the freedom fighters, or should have supported the freedom fighters in Hungary in 1956, incited them to rebellion, even though we knew that they would not succeed.

July 8, 1985

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5253

We should incite the freedom fighters, or potential freedom fighters in Poland to rebellion even though we do not believe that they have an opportunity to succeed.

In many ways I believe that would be a self-defeating proposition, so the question then becomes: How do you differentiate between freedom fighters in one area of the world and freedom fighters in another area of the world?

□ 1400

And that is where I find Mr. Nixon's words so insightful. He suggests to us that not only should we be committed to freedom fighters who in fact attempt to throw off the yoke of oppression in many cases, in most cases that yoke held down on them by Communist regimes, but that we must act when that is in the national interest of the United States and when in fact those freedom fighters have some chance of success.

Using the three-pronged approach, it seems to me very evident that support for the Contras in Nicaragua is essential.

Many people do not understand that Nicaragua and El Salvador are closer to many parts of the United States—to parts of California and to parts of Texas, to many parts of the United States—than is Washington, DC. Many people fail to understand that as we deal with the tremendous problem of immigration, illegal immigration from South and Central America, there is a tremendous land bridge that goes from the very tip of South America up into the innards of the United States, that it is a direct route, that it is fairly easy for people to cross the Rio Grande, that it is fairly easy for someone who really intends to do so to come into these United States if he or she wants to come back a second, a third, or a fourth time after getting caught.

People should understand that the number of people from countries other than Mexico has increased substantially in the last decade, that we have people coming from Central and South America, and that unless the United States assists in establishing stability in that region of the world, and unless the United States assists in establishing governments to give some opportunity for expression of political decisionmaking, expression of economic rights, expression of religious rights in those countries, we will continue to have even larger numbers of people coming to the United States day after day, month after month, year after year.

So it is very much in the interest of the United States that we assist in that region of the world; it is very much in the interest of the United States that we recognize the threat that communism poses in that area of the world.

Go back 25 or 30 years and suggest that someone named Fidel Castro would take over the country of Cuba

and then not only communize it but then be the basis for support for Communist excursions into other parts of Central and South America, and you would have been laughed at. No one took it seriously. Others said, "Let him take care of his own country. It is unfortunate that he has imposed communism there. Batista was not a good ruler. Things will improve down there. We have nothing to fear." And yet we have seen the cancer that started in Cuba grow and metastasize in other parts of Central and South America.

Others today say, "Don't worry about Nicaragua. They overthrew the evil Somoza regime." And we will recognize, all of us, I think, that in fact it was evil in many respects. But was the Nicaraguan Sandinista Communist government the only alternative, and should it be the only alternative when there are freedom fighters willing to fight and die for the chance to obtain some democratic principles in action in their own country?

We have a heavy burden here in the House of Representatives that we share with our colleagues in the other body and that is not only to look out for the parochial interests of the constituency in our own particular districts but to look out for the overall national interests which affect every individual in this country, no matter whether he or she is represented by us in our particular district or not. And we have an obligation to look at the long-range questions of Central and South America that are in the overall national interest of the United States.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would behoove us to look very carefully at the words of Richard Nixon in the article, "The Case for Supporting Third World Freedom Fighters," because I believe it gives us an outline, it establishes criteria, that we might be able to utilize, so that we can determine where in fact it is of benefit for us to aid freedom fighters and where it is not only not in our interest but not in the interest of the freedom fighters themselves to take part in a battle that they cannot win.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would invite my colleagues to look at this article in its entirety as it appeared in the Record several weeks ago when placed there by the minority leader.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from California, on a significant contribution that he is making to the public dialog. He is discussing a matter that I think is core central to one of the problems which besets us internally. He has pointed up very wisely, in my personal opinion, the truly significant fact that the solution to our problem of illegal aliens lies not here in the United States so much as south of our borders and Cen-

tral and even South America and that the greatest challenge confronting us in this Hemisphere is to try to find the right ways in which we may assist at their request those nations which are trying to preserve political freedoms while at the same time demonstrating that they can come to grips with the legitimate social and economic problems that beset their people without sacrificing their political liberties.

I just wanted to congratulate my friend, the gentleman from California, for his leadership in pointing up this very important problem.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, again I rise to address the privileged order of not only this country but the privileged orders, in the words of the originator of this phrase and this type of address, Joel Barlow, the American Revolutionary hero, chaplain for Washington's army, a pamphleteer and a great libertarian, in the sense that he was one of those in the forefront of the struggle for independence, and realizing that the struggle transcended the United States' newly born nationhood and the British Kingdom or the English King, but also what ruled the day throughout the world, monarchy, with special reference to the West, what we call Europe today.

And I do so because I see the great commotion, the travail, the gnashing of teeth that has been raging more recently on the occasion of the taking of the hostages aboard the Trans World airliner, and I want to point out to my colleagues that this subject matter was of great concern and interest to me on the occasion of the first such action on the part of Iran in 1979 in which the Embassy of the United States and its inhabitants and workers were held hostage by the Government of Iran, and the fact that nobody seemed to be aware, any more than they are today, of the foresight of the men who wrote the Constitution, the contemporaries of Joel Barlow, in which they clearly foresaw the kind of international piracy that beset their world as much as it is now ours, except in that day and time there was no such thing as air travel, of course, and the piracy was on the high seas.

One month after the hostages had been taken, that is, the month of December 1979 I addressed a letter to President Carter and also addressed the House, pointing out that the Constitution provided very specifically in article I, section 8, clause 10, all the needed powers which my colleagues, especially those who spoke on the subject matter generally today, and, more